

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,862	07/31/2003	Masahiro Kojima	116753	9070
25944 7	590 05/16/2006	EXAMINER		INER
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			COOKE, COLLEEN P	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				PAPER NUMBER
			1754	
		DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

$ \swarrow $	
Idress	
0) DAYS,	
ommunication.	
e merits is	
FR 1.121(d).	
ГО-152.	
Stage	
	ĺ

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/630,862	KOJIMA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Colleen P. Cooke	1754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S).OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Ma	arch 2006.					
	action is non-final.					
		secution as to the merits is				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	priority under 35 H.S.C. & 119(a)	h-(d) or (f)				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
, , ,	s have been received					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
<ul> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>						
-	•	ru III IIIs Mational Stage				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/22/05</u> .	6) Other:	·				
Potost and Tendament Office						

#### Election/Restrictions

Claim 2 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 9/15/05.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gao et al. (5180707).

Gao et al. teaches a Bi-Pb-Sr-Ca-Cu-O superconductor thick film (Column 1, lines 37-39) formed on a substrate which has a final superconductor of the "2223" phase (Column 3, lines 12-15; Column 5, lines 54-56). Gao et al. also teaches that the superconductor has a final structure having no cracks and good adhesion (Column 2, lines 16-38; Column 3, lines 36-43; Column 4, lines 29-33; Column 7, lines 10-11) and therefore no fracture surface exists in the vicinity of the interface between the substrate and the base.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-199023 in view of Sinh ("Properties of the Bi-surplus superconducting Bi<sub>2.1-x</sub>Pb<sub>x</sub>Sr<sub>2</sub>Ca<sub>2</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>O<sub>y</sub> compounds").

JP 02-199023 teaches an oxide superconducting thick film on a substrate which has no cracking or debonding (see abstract). JP 02-199023 teaches that the superconductor can be  $Bi_2(Sr,Ca)_4Cu_3O_y \ but \ does \ not \ teach \ that \ the \ superconductor \ is \ a \ Pb-containing \ BSCCO \ as claimed.$ 

Sinh teaches that the addition of Pb to BSCCO materials improves the mechanical and electrical properties of a BSCCO material (see Introduction).

It would have been obvious to modify the superconductor having a thick film of BSCCO by introducing Pb into the BSCCO material because Sinh teaches that doing so improves the properties of the superconductor, particularly with a surplus of Bi as taught in the last sentence of the Introduction.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,042. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the oxide superconductor of the patent claim is a product-by-process which would appear to inherently possess the feature of the instant claim wherein no fracture surface exists in the vicinity of the interface between the substrate and the base.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colleen P. Cooke whose telephone number is 571-272-1170. She can normally be reached Mon.-Fri. 9:00 am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Stan Silverman can be reached at 571-272-1358. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/630,862

Art Unit: 1754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Colleen P Cooke Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754 Page 5